

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 38-62 are pending. Applicant's remarks after Final are appropriate under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because they address the Office's
5 remarks in the Final Action, and thus could not have been presented earlier. In addition, the remarks should be entered to place the application in better form for appeal.

35 U.S.C. §102 Claim Rejections

10 Claims 38-40, 42, 45, 51-53, and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,995,774 to Applegate et al. (hereinafter, "Applegate") (*Office Action* p.2). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

15 Claim 38 recites a method comprising "receiving a component of a printing device that has been utilized within the printing device and subsequently removed from the printing device, the component including a memory component that maintains printing-related data", "retrieving the printing-related data from the memory component after the memory component
20 has been removed from the printing device", and "utilizing the printing-related data for printing analysis."

Applegate does not show or disclose retrieving the printing-related data from the memory component after the memory component has been removed from the printing device, as recited in claim 38. Applegate simply states that,
25 for a non-reusable cartridge, the life cycle of the cartridge should be limited to a single load of toner material (*Applegate* col.6, line 66 to col.7, line 2). There is nothing described in the cited sections of Applegate about retrieving

printing-related data from the memory component after the memory component has been removed from the printing device, as recited in claim 38.

Applegate also does not show or disclose “utilizing the printing-related data for printing analysis, as recited in claim 38. Applegate states that the
5 printer makes decisions about the use of a cartridge based on the measured quantity of toner (*Applegate* col.28, lines 18-20). This teaches away from Applicant’s claim 38 which also recites that the memory component has been removed from the printing device. Applegate does not teach utilizing the printing-related data for printing analysis after the memory component is
10 removed from the printing device, as recited in claim 38.

Accordingly, claim 38 is allowable over Applegate for at least these reasons and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

15 Claims 39-40, 42, and 45 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 38. Additionally, some or all of claims 39-40, 42, and 45 are allowable over Applegate for independent reasons. For example:

Claim 45 recites that “the printing-related data includes print media usage data”. Applegate does not show or disclose print media usage data, as
20 recited in claim 45. The Office cites Applegate for a memory device that is updated to indicate a toner level (*Office Action* p.3; *Applegate* col.6, lines 10-26). Applegate only discusses toner material, and there is no indication of print media in the cited section of Applegate (e.g., print media being paper, plastic, fabric, and the like, as described in the subject application at p.5,
25 line 26). Accordingly, claim 45 is allowable over Applegate and the §102 rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 51 recites a method comprising “receiving a replaceable printing component that has been utilized within a printing device and subsequently removed from the printing device, the replaceable printing component having print media usage data maintained therewith, the print media usage data being
5 collected during one or more printing operations”, “retrieving the print media usage data from the replaceable printing component after the replaceable printing component has been removed from the printing device”, and “utilizing the print media usage data for printing analysis.”

The Office rejects claim 51 along with claim 38 (for the same reasoning)
10 (*Office Action* p.2). However claim 51 recites different feature(s) than claim 38. As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 45, Applegate does not show or disclose print media usage data, as recited in claim 51. The Office cites to sections of Applegate that only describe a memory device which is updated to indicate a toner level (*Office Action* p.2; *Applegate* col.6, lines
15 10-26; col.6, line 57 to col.7, line 2; col.28, lines 8-21). There is no discussion in the cited sections of Applegate of print media, or of print media usage data, as recited in claim 51.

As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 38, Applegate also does not show or disclose retrieving the print media usage data
20 from the replaceable printing component after the replaceable printing component has been removed from the printing device, as recited in claim 51. Applegate simply states that, for a non-reusable cartridge, the life cycle of the cartridge should be limited to a single load of toner material (*Applegate* col.6, line 66 to col.7, line 2). There is nothing described in the cited sections of
25 Applegate about retrieving print media usage data from a replaceable printing component after the replaceable printing component has been removed from the printing device, as recited in claim 51.

Applegate also does not show or disclose “utilizing the print media usage data for printing analysis, as recited in claim 51. Applegate states that the printer makes decisions about the use of a cartridge based on the measured quantity of toner (*Applegate* col.28, lines 18-20). This teaches away from

5 Applicant’s claim 51 which also recites that the replaceable printing component has been removed from the printing device. Applegate does not teach utilizing the print media usage data for printing analysis after the replaceable printing component is removed from the printing device, as recited in claim 51.

Accordingly, claim 51 is allowable over Applegate for at least these

10 reasons and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 52-53 and 55 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 51. Additionally, some or all of claims 52-53 and 55-56 are allowable

15 over Applegate for independent reasons.

35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections

Claims 41, 54, and 61-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Applegate in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,658,219 to Ito et al.

20 (hereinafter “Ito”) (*Office Action* p.4). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 43-44 and 56-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Applegate in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,039,430 to Helterline (hereinafter, “Helterline”) (*Office Action* p.6). Applicant respectfully traverses

25 the rejection.

Claims 46-50 and 58-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Applegate in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,097,497 to McGraw

(hereinafter, “McGraw”) (*Office Action* p.7). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

5 Claim 41 is allowable by virtue of its dependency upon claim 38 which is allowable over Applegate for at least the reasons described above in response to the §102 rejection of claim 38. Claim 41 is also allowable over the Applegate-Ito combination because Ito does not address the deficiencies of Applegate as described above in the response to the rejection of claim 38.

10 Claims 54 and 61-62 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 51 which is allowable over Applegate for at least the reasons described above in response to the §102 rejection of claim 51. Claims 54 and 61-62 are also allowable over the Applegate-Ito combination because Ito does not address the deficiencies of Applegate as described above in the response to the rejection of claim 51.

15 Claims 61 and 62 are also allowable over Ito for independent reasons. Claim 61 recites that “a manufacturer of the replaceable printing component receives the replaceable printing component and retrieves the print media usage data”, and Claim 62 recites “providing the print media usage data to a manufacturer of the replaceable printing component”.

20 Ito does not teach or suggest that a manufacturer retrieves the print media usage data, as recited in claim 61, or that print media usage data is provided to a manufacturer, as recited in claim 62. Ito only describes recycling a toner cartridge if operable and loading the cartridge with toner (*Ito* col.15, lines 10-16). There is no discussion in Ito that teaches print media usage data is retrieved, as recited in claim 61, or that print media usage data is provided to
25 a manufacturer, as recited in claim 62.

Accordingly, claims 61 and 62 are allowable over the Applegate-Ito combination for at least these additional reasons and the §102 rejection should be withdrawn.

5 Claims 43-44 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 38 which is allowable over Applegate for at least the reasons described above in response to the §102 rejection of claim 38. Claims 43-44 are also allowable over the Applegate-Helterline combination because Helterline does not address the deficiencies of Applegate as described above in the response to the
10 rejection of claim 38.

Claims 56-57 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 51 which is allowable over Applegate for at least the reasons described above in response to the §102 rejection of claim 51. Claims 56-57 are also allowable over the Applegate-Helterline combination because Helterline does not address
15 the deficiencies of Applegate as described above in the response to the rejection of claim 51.

Claims 46-50 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 38 which is allowable over Applegate for at least the reasons described above in
20 response to the §102 rejection of claim 38. Claims 46-50 are also allowable over the Applegate-McGraw combination because McGraw does not address the deficiencies of Applegate as described above in the response to the rejection of claim 38.

Claims 58-60 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 51
25 which is allowable over Applegate for at least the reasons described above in response to the §102 rejection of claim 51. Claims 58-60 are also allowable over the Applegate- McGraw combination because McGraw does not address

the deficiencies of Applegate as described above in the response to the rejection of claim 51.

Conclusion

5 Pending claims 38-62 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that preclude issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

10

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: Feb 22, 2005

By:



David A. Morasch

Reg. No. 42,905

(509) 324-9256 x 210

15